



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HC
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,742	05/03/2001	Scott E. Boatman	PA-5259-RFB	8028

7590 05/07/2003

RICHARD J. GODLEWSKI
PO BOX 2269
BLOOMINGTON, IN 47402-2269

EXAMINER

SERKE, CATHERINE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/848,742

Applicant(s)

BOATMAN ET AL. *cm*

Examiner

Catherine Serke

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4,5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 8-11 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Engelson et al (US Pat# 5,531,715). Engelson discloses a medical device having a catheter shaft with three portions of flexibility. The variability of flexibility is altered by the change of material durometer for each portion.

Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Preissman et al (US Pat# 5,728,063). Preissman discloses a medical device having a catheter shaft with three portions of flexibility. The variability of flexibility is altered by the change of material durometer for each portion. The device also includes two concentric shafts with a balloon located at the distal end of the shafts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3763

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Preissman et al. Preissman meets the claim limitations as described above but fails to include a malecot, pigtail or loop. However, Preissman discloses a balloon which is a type of anchoring mechanism. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to substitute the balloon with a malecot, pigtail or loop since these anchoring devices are well known in the art to achieve the same function while allowing blood flow to continue in the vessel. The motivation for the combination would have been to enhance the safety of the patient.

Claims 19-25 and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engelson et al or Preissman et al. Both Engelson et al and Preissman et al independently meet the claim limitations above but fail to disclose the claimed materials. However, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use. The prior art devices function as claimed and therefore a substitution of materials would have been an obvious design choice based on availability and costs.

Claims 26-27 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Preissman et al. Preissman meets the claim limitations as described above but fails to include the claimed materials. However, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use. The prior art devices function as claimed and therefore a substitution of materials would have been an obvious design choice based on availability and costs.

Art Unit: 3763

Allowable Subject Matter


Claim12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catherine Serke whose telephone number is 703-308-4846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 703-308-3552. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-2192.

Catherine Serke 
May 5, 2003


BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700